

Aging and Disability Resource Connection (ADRC)

Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

May 18, 2018

Committee Members Present:

Dani Anderson
Paula Margeson
Derrell Kelch
Victoria Jump
Pam Miller
Elsa Quezada

Committee Members Attending by Phone:

Paula Acosta
Maribel Marin
Karli Holkko
Eldon Luce

State Agency Representatives Present:

Dean Fujimoto, CDA
Marianne Gammon, CDA
Robin Jordan, CDA
Irene Walela, DOR

11:00 Opening of Meeting

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order and members introduced.

Agenda Item 2: 211 Update from Maribel Marin (agenda changed due to Maribel's limited availability)

211 has entered into a partnership with the California State Association of Counties Finance Corporation. They will provide executive administrative support as 211s continue to develop the infrastructure to expand the statewide networks to the 19 remaining counties that do not have service. We hope to have active 211 services in the remaining counties within the next 24 months.

Eventually all 211 providers should be accredited agency. We are developing a technical assistance program to assist accreditation processes. The 211s try to do as much certification as possible. We continue to schedule the certifications around the state to make sure that all the 211s and AAA's have opportunity to train and test their staff.

The majority of CAIRS members are area agencies on aging followed by 211 providers and miscellaneous organizations.

Pam Miller asked for clarification on sustainability. Maribel discussed the short term strategy: utilizing implementation dollars from SB1212. Long term strategy is support from multiple sources, including the hope of tapping into cannabis tax monies.

Agenda Item 3: Review Agenda and Approve January 19, 2017 Notes

The January 19th, 2018 meeting notes were approved. Paula Margeson asked that two items be added to the agenda regarding the possible funding announced by ACL to support data collection and analysis and the second item was the additional 19 million that is being proposed for the continuation of the MFP program. The group agreed to add these items to the agenda. Derrell Kelch asked to add an additional item to the agenda: a discussion about the length of service of the committee chairs. All agreed to this discussion.

Agenda Item 4: Vision Discussion

Robin Jordan gave a brief history of vision statements from April of 2014 ("Community living is an options for all"), July 2015 ("California continues to seek to develop a statewide network of ADRCs that provide unbiased reliable information and options to individuals seeking long term support and services") and December 2017 ("California has a comprehensive statewide network of ADRCs that facilitate access to services and support based on individual's needs, preferences, and goals.")

Dani Anderson commented that these are mission statements, but not vision statements. Committee members discussed at length the difference between a vision statement and a mission statement, and also various proposed versions of a new vision statement, but none were adopted. This evolved into a discussion of the mission of the California Collaborative for Long Term Services and who from the Advisory Committee attends those meetings. Irene Walela stated that she does participate in that forum and some felt that greater exchange between the California Collaborative and ADRC Advisory Committee would be beneficial. Derrell Kelch countered that the purpose of the ADRC Advisory

committee is to assist the development of the ADRCs around the State of California, but not to take on long term care policy. And even with that narrow mission, he did not feel the Advisory Committee had been very effective. Paula Margeson pointed to the success of passing AB1200 as a definitive success which was the result of the Advisory Committee's work.

Robin reviewed the list of existing ADRCs as follows: Alameda County, Nevada County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Diego County, San Francisco County and Ventura County.

She also gave a brief update on developing ADRC's as follows:

Yolo County is on hold

Placer County is moving along and is now on the toughest part of the application: protocols

Yuba Sutter is coming along well

Monterrey Bay is coming along, too, and may be able to submit an application by the end of June

Robin Jordan answered a question regarding ongoing monitoring of existing ADRCs. Robin stated there is not an established procedure for this.

Several committee members discussed the value of some marketing to those AAA's and ILC's who have not participated in the ADRC development process. Derrell Kelch believes that for a time there was a lot of frustration around the State about the designation process, and that a new marketing push might be a way to update potential participants that the designation process has been streamlined.

The Committee discussed putting together an "ADRC Fact Sheet" for outreach purposes.

Victoria Jump suggested a webinar or conference call targeting Directors of AAAs and ILCs to walk them through the current designation process and showcase the value of designation that the established ADRCs have experienced. The group was receptive to this idea.

Dean Fujimoto pointed out that the existing ADRCs receive a small amount of money from the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act (MIPPA) contract with CDA; however, only two are actually using their funding on ADRC development. The other five transfer this money to HICAP.

Robin Jordan added that another source of money for ADRCs allows you to take Medicaid dollars and use them for a list of administrative activities. Joseph Lugo did a presentation on it for us in the last couple of years.

Paula Margeson asked about the staff support that came with the move of the ADRC unit from Department of Health Care Services to California Department of Aging. Paula Acosta stated that it was Carol Schwartzlander, Ed Aherns, Paula Acosta and two or three consultants. Currently staffing consists of Robin Jordan, Marianne Gammon and Paula Acosta provides technical assistance in some instances. Marianne Gammon is in a limited term position which, by law, ends in mid-Sept. The funding for the position will continue if the inter-agency agreement with DHCS is renewed.

Pam Miller commented that she felt she had gotten great support from Robin, but that she is overwhelmed due to her work load which consists of one functional ADRC and attempting to get three others up and running.

Agenda Item 5: Chairperson Terms (Agenda amended at request of Derrell Kelch)

Derrell Kelch believes that it is time for him to relinquish his role on the Advisory Committee as Co-chair. He suggested that Victoria Jump replace him. Derrell would like to continue to be a member of the committee if all are agreeable to that. A motion was passed supporting the nomination of Victoria Jump to co-chair.

Robin Jordan raised the issue of how to get a representative from the Veteran's Administration to participate in the Advisory Committee.

In addition, there was support for including a representative from the California Collaborative for Long Term Services.

Agenda Item 6 and 7: Training and Survey Results of Elsevier Training

Marianne Gammon shared information gathered from the Survey Monkey sent to all learners who participated in the Elsevier training. Results of the survey were generally positive. Please see survey results posted concurrently with these notes.

Accessibility of various documents was discussed. The Elsevier Training program was not accessible. It was clarified by Irene Walela that while it is relatively quick and easy to CREATE an accessible document, it is much more time consuming and cumbersome to remediate an existing document. As of July 1, 2019, all California State websites and documents contained on them must be certified as accessible.

Robin Jordan solicited a document from ACL that itemizes the kinds of ADRC trainings done across the country. It is a PDF and not very accessible, but Irene Walela offered to make the document accessible and then it will be distributed to committee members.

Robin also noted that ACL has posted transcripts of the Elsevier training, though because they are constructed to accompany the interactive training, which is not provided, they would need significant adaptation to be very useful.

Victoria Jump states she would like to develop a list of trainings which could be a "standard" set that is recommended to all ADRCs.

Agenda Item 8: Home and Community Based Waiver (HCBA) Update (out of order)

Karli Holkko provided an overview of the status of HCBA as follows:

Because the HCBA has grown, DHCS decided to delegate the case management function to community based organizations. DHCS released a solicitation for application on October 4th, 2017 to community based organizations who were interested in taking over case management of participants. They received 17 applications. After extensive review of the applicants, 9 applicants were designated “labor agencies”. These organizations will cover 99% of all current waiver participants. In the areas that are not covered, DHCS nurses will continue case management of waiver participants.

DHCS is targeting July 1, 2018 as the start date for the labor agencies. A 60 day notice has been released to the client waiver participants and current direct service providers to let them know about upcoming changes and what to expect.

Current enrollment in the HCBS waiver is in the low 4000s. Increased slots have been requested for a total of 8974 slots over the five-year renewal period and will expand the waiver by 1000 slots each waiver year.

Paula Margeson asked about the possibility of success of the proposal to award \$19 million dollars to continue the CCT program, and if it is successful, how it would be implemented.

Karli commented about the complexity of the issue, even if funding is successful. The challenges are:

-DHCS would need renewed authority to operate the CCT program on both the Federal and State side. They would also need renewed authority to draw down the federal match monies.

Karli also announced that she is leaving her job at DHCS and her last day will be May 31st. She does not know who her replacement on the ADRC Advisory Committee will be at this time.

Agenda Item 9: Partner Updates/Data Report

Irene Walela relayed Department of Rehabilitation (DOR) position on the ACL request for applications for the “no wrong door” grant. Because the intent of the grant is to engage in data collection to demonstrate the business case for a “no wrong door” approach, DOR did not believe it was positioned to put a grant package together. Dean Fujimoto commented that California Department of Aging (CDA) came to a similar conclusion to DOR. The data elements that ACL is looking for are just not available yet in California. In addition, the timeline was not workable. If California were successful in securing grant funding, because of the timing of California processes, by the time the project was up and running, there would only be enough time to collect three to six months of data.

Data subcommittee has not met due to conflicts in the groups schedule. Only one of seven designated ADRCs has submitted data.

Agenda Item 10: Next Steps

There will be no meeting in July. The next meeting will be August 17, 2018.

Meeting was adjourned.